



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF CHESTERFIELD  
MEETING SUMMARY  
JANUARY 11, 2021**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

**I. ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT**

**ABSENT**

Commissioner Allison Harris  
Commissioner John Marino  
Commissioner Debbie Midgley  
Commissioner Nathan Roach  
Commissioner Gene Schenberg  
Commissioner Jane Staniforth  
Commissioner Guy Tilman (*not present at Roll Call, but arrived shortly thereafter*)  
Commissioner Steven Wuennenberg  
Chair Merrell Hansen

Mayor Bob Nation  
Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison  
Mr. Michael Lindgren, representing City Attorney Christopher Graville  
Mr. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning  
Mr. Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner  
Mr. Chris Dietz, Planner  
Ms. Annisa Kumerow, Planner  
Ms. Mary Ann Madden, Recording Secretary

Chair Hansen acknowledged the attendance of Mayor Bob Nation; Councilmember Dan Hurt, Council Liaison; Councilmember Mary Monachella, Ward I; and Councilmember Mary Ann Mastorakos, Ward II.

**II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**III. SILENT PRAYER**

**IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS** - Commissioner Schenberg read the “Opening Comments” for the Public Hearing.

- A. P.Z. 13-2020 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code—Article 4)**: An ordinance amending Article 4 of the Unified Development Code to revise language pertaining to architectural review design standards.

## **STAFF PRESENTATION:**

Planner Chris Dietz provided the following information about the subject site:

### **Background**

On May 14, 2020, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) requested that Staff explore adding language in the Unified Development Code (UDC) pertaining to modification of existing buildings throughout the City.

After presenting the issue to the Planning & Public Works Committee (PPW), Staff was also directed to seek input from ARB regarding adding language to the UDC relative to screening rooftop mechanical equipment within sections of the City Center land use designation. ARB has provided recommendations for both modifications to existing structures and screening of rooftop equipment. Staff has also prepared minor updates to this section of code.

### **Amendment #1: Modification to Existing Structures**

Mr. Dietz pointed out that the Architectural Review Design Standards currently do not have language specific to the redevelopment and modification of existing buildings. As older buildings redevelop throughout the City, these buildings should be advancing towards the Architectural Review Design Standards as if they were new developments.

A seventh category will be added to Section 404.04.010.D of the Unified Development Code with the following proposed language: (*changes shown in red*)

#### Section 405.04.010.D.7:

**Existing Structures:** All additions and exterior renovations to existing structures shall advance such structures toward further compliance with the provision of Section 405.04.010.D. of the Unified Development Code. Exterior additions shall be incorporated into one cohesive design with the existing structure.

### **Amendment #2: Screening of Rooftop Mechanical Equipment**

Mr. Dietz explained that Ordinance No. 3114 already provides language regarding rooftop screening for portions of City Center. The language has been modified to include ARB's recommendations, and will now apply to both the Urban Transition and Downtown subareas. The proposed language is shown below, which incorporates language from Ordinance 3114 and ARB. (*additions to Ordinance 3114 language shown in red*)

#### Section 405.04.010.D.2.k.

Rooftop equipment **in the geographic areas of the City Center (Downtown) and City Center (Urban Transition) land use designations within the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan** shall be permitted on roofs **of new buildings** within architecturally designed, fully enclosed penthouses that complement the building design.

### **Amendment #3: Supplemental Updates**

Staff identified a few minor inconsistencies within the Architectural Review Design Guidelines, which should be updated within Code. (*changes shown in red*)

Section 04-01.A. Applicability and Compliance

#### 3. Exemptions.

- a) Single residential lots are exempt from the provisions of these ARB Design Standards, provided no construction, addition or alteration of a non-residential building is proposed.
- b) Residential additions and tear downs are reviewed under Section 405.20.160 of this UDC.
- c) Non-residential additions and architectural amendments that meet ~~all of~~ the following criteria may be considered for administrative approval by the Director of Planning. Said approval shall be at the discretion of the Director of Planning if:
  - (1) The proposed addition is less than 5,000 sq. ft.; or
  - (2) ~~The proposed addition does not impact the site such that the approved plan for the site must be reviewed by utility and fire protection agencies;~~

Section 04-01 D. General Requirements for Building Design

- 5. Signage. Signs and sign packages are reviewed through a separate process. All signs shall adhere to the Unified Development Code (UDC) and/or the Sign Package for the site. ~~For existing buildings under review for additions or alterations the following shall apply:~~
  - ~~a) Integrate sign locations into the building or development design theme.~~
  - ~~b) New sign locations proposed for existing buildings shall be compatible with existing building signage locations. Where no sign package exists, unifying elements such as size, shape, or materials shall be used to create continuity.~~

**Discussion**

Considerable discussion ensued regarding the proposed amendment (*shown below*) pertaining to screening of rooftop mechanical equipment:

Rooftop equipment in the geographic areas of the City Center (Downtown) and City Center (Urban Transition) land use designations within the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan shall be permitted on roofs of new buildings within architecturally designed, fully enclosed penthouses that complement the building design.

Councilmember Hurt explained that the Planning & Public Works Committee (PPW) had requested a review of the requirements regarding screening of rooftop equipment because of concerns about Wildhorse Village where the buildings sit lower than Chesterfield Parkway. Consequently, roofs are seen at grade level from Chesterfield Parkway, with a direct view of rooftop mechanical equipment. Since the developer agreed to place a penthouse around all the mechanical equipment within the Wildhorse Village development as a “trade-off” for the proposed taller buildings and tower, PPW Committee recommended that all rooftop equipment within portions of the City Center be placed within penthouses.

Mr. Justin Wyse, Director of Planning, clarified that the proposed language regarding penthouse screening only applies to new buildings – not to an existing building requesting modifications. It was also noted that the City currently requires screening of all rooftop mechanical equipment, but does not require a fully-enclosed penthouse.

Commissioner Tilman expressed concern that if fully-enclosed penthouses are required for rooftop equipment, it could have a direct economic impact on future development within the City because of the higher costs involved. He also pointed out that the money required for penthouses could prohibit spending on more desirable amenities, such as landscaping or higher design of buildings.

Commissioner Marino also questioned the requirement for penthouses vs. the typical type of rooftop screening.

Through discussions with ARB members, Councilmember Hurt's understanding is that the main concept of a "penthouse" is that the paneling around the screening would match the architecture of the building – not that the penthouse would necessarily be fully-finished or have a roof on it.

Commissioner Tilman objected to the proposed language of *fully enclosed penthouse*. He pointed out that such a structure makes replacement of equipment more expensive because there are no open sides of the screening giving easy access to the equipment.

Commissioner Staniforth agreed that the proposed language could place an undue burden on some developers. She suggested that the City continue with requiring screening of rooftop equipment and review each development on a case-by-case basis to determine if additional screening measures are needed.

Mr. Dietz then provided the current language within Section 405.04.010.D.2.j of the Unified Development Code regarding screening of rooftop equipment:

Screen rooftop equipment on all visible sides with materials that are an integral part of the architecture. Parapet walls or screen walls shall be treated as an integral part of the architecture and shall not visually weaken the design of the structure.

Mayor Nation noted his opinion that if good screening requirements are already in place, there is not a need to require penthouses.

Mr. Wyse acknowledged the points made, and stated that after closing the Public Hearing, the discussion would be continued under "Unfinished Business".

## **V. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY**

Commissioner Schenberg made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of the December 14, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Staniforth.

Commissioner Midgley stated that she was not in attendance at the December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting, but the meeting summary shows her in attendance. It was noted that the Recording Secretary would correct the minutes.

The motion to approve the Meeting Summary, as corrected, **passed by a voice vote of 7 to 0.** (*Commissioners Midgley and Roach abstained.*)

## VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

### **Downtown Chesterfield, Categories A & B (ASDCP)**

The following individuals, representing the Petitioner, were available for questions:

1. Mr. George Stock, President, Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, Inc., 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO.
2. Mr. Andrew Dixon, P.E., Stock & Associates Consulting Engineers, Inc., 257 Chesterfield Business Parkway, Chesterfield, MO.
3. Mr. Jeff Tegethoff, Operating Partner, Wildhorse Village, LP, 2199 Innerbelt Business Center Drive, St. Louis, MO.
4. Mr. J. Andrew Kilmer, Principal, Lamar Johnson Collaborative LLC, 2199 Innerbelt Business Center Drive, St. Louis, MO.

### **Chesterfield Outlets (The District) 8<sup>th</sup> AAE**

The following individuals, representing the Petitioner, were available for questions:

1. Mr. Darren Ridenhour, 2127 Innerbelt Business Center Drive, Ste. 200, St. Louis, MO.
2. Mr. Steven Mueller, 1401 S. Brentwood Blvd., Ste. 575, St. Louis, MO

## VII. SITE PLANS, BUILDING ELEVATIONS AND PLATS

- A. Downtown Chesterfield, (Categories A&B) ASDCP:** An Amended Site Development Concept Plan, Landscape Concept Plan, Signage Concept Plan, and Lighting Fixture Concept Plan for the 78.4 acre tract of land located south of Wild Horse Creek Road, west of Chesterfield Parkway, and north and east of Burkhardt Place.

It was noted that discussion of this item was not completed in the earlier Site Plan Committee Meeting. Commissioner Schenberg stated that the Committee discussed concerns regarding landscaping, the picnic lawn area, lunch break courtyard, and sight lines. Mr. Kilmer was then asked to continue his presentation regarding landscaping.

Mr. Kilmer explained that, as landscape architects, they focus on how to create open spaces that are used four seasons of the year, which involves solar heat in certain areas and shade in other areas. Because of the challenging topography of the site, they take advantage of those opportunities where they are able to flatten and modify grades to accommodate gathering spaces.

### **Trees**

Commissioner Harris asked for information about the size of trees when planted and growth rates per year. Mr. Kilmer responded that trees are generally 6-8 ft. tall at time of planting; evergreens grow faster than deciduous trees; and some trees grow up to 2 feet per year while oaks only grow about 6 inches per year.

Commissioner Harris referred to the concerns raised at the Site Plan Committee that some of the gathering places do not include trees to provide shade. She noted that because of the size of the trees at planting and yearly growth expectations that even if trees were installed in these areas, not much shade would be provided for years to come.

Mr. Tegethoff of Wildhorse Village pointed out that mature trees are generally not planted because of the low survivor rate of large trees. Commissioner Harris agreed that large trees should not be planted and if shade is desired, alternatives have to be found, or individuals will just seek out other areas in which to eat.

Noting the number of street trees, trees around the lake, and trees in the residential area, Commissioner Wuennenberg stated that “this is a gorgeous piece of property”. He added that the developer has “done a fantastic job” by doing what was asked of them by keeping the view corridors open, and he does not see a need to change anything.

Commissioner Marino stated that he really likes the design and appreciates the comments made regarding the trees and shade. As a parent of young children, he offered the perspective of families sitting on the slope and being able to keep an eye on their children without sight lines being obstructed by trees.

### **Monument Signs**

Commissioner Schenberg asked for clarification about how wording would be scaled on the monument signs as one rendering appears to show the letters running off the edge of the sign. Mr. Mike Knight, Assistant City Planner, explained that primary and secondary monument signs will be utilized throughout the development with the intent of creating a cohesive look. The signs will be consistent in style, but varied in size. He also noted that any monument signs for individual lots will carry the same concept of signage.

Mr. Knight also pointed out that the Signage Concept Plan is tied solely to this site-specific ordinance to help create uniformity over the 78 acres. Approval of the Signage Concept Plan entails: (1) approval of the design concept; (2) approval of the elements of the monument signs; and (3) approval of the primary monument sign, which sits at the entrance of the 300-foot view corridor. The size of the primary monument sign conforms to City code.

Approval does not include the sizes of all the independent secondary signage on individual lots. As individual lots are developed, section plans will be submitted showing the specifics of proposed signs. If there would be a desire to deviate from code, the developer would be required to submit a sign package.

### **Public Access**

There are three public access points to the interior lake, which are near the view corridors. Individual section plans could possibly add additional connection points to the lake.

Mr. Tegethoff explained that the path around the lake is approximately .6 miles and by having three access points, there is a connection point about every ¼ of a mile. People can also access the path by walking down the hills. He noted that having more than three access points would make the site less natural-looking.

### **Riparian Trail Connections**

There are two connections to the Riparian Trail – one near the YMCA, and one at the intersection of Burkhardt and Wild Horse Creek Road.

### **Slope/Grade**

Councilmember Hurt referred to the 3:1 slopes down to the lake near Lake Front Drive, and questioned whether there would be any step-downs between the buildings. Mr. Tegethoff stated that because the buildings have not yet been fully designed, he could not confirm this. Once the buildings are fully designed, they will be able to work with the City on what is desired.

### **Parking**

Public parking is provided through 134 spaces along the streets, and within the parking garages on Lots 2 and 3.

Commissioner Schenberg made a motion recommending approval of the **Amended Site Development Concept Plan, Landscape Concept Plan, Signage Concept Plan, and Lighting Fixture Concept Plan, as submitted, for Downtown Chesterfield, (Categories A&B)**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wuennenberg.

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

**Aye: Commissioner Tilman, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Marino, Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Roach, Commissioner Schenberg, Commissioner Staniforth, Chair Hansen**

**Nay: None**

The motion **passed** by a vote of 9 to 0.

- B. Chesterfield Outlets (The District) 8<sup>th</sup> AAE:** Amended Architectural Elevations for a 48.15 acre site within the “PC” Planned Commercial District located north of N Outer 40 Road and east of Boone’s Crossing. (17T420027)

Planner Annisa Kumerow provided the following information about the proposed Amended Architectural Elevations.

### **History**

In 2019, Phase I of the District was reviewed by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) and approved by Planning Commission. Amended Architectural Elevations were approved in 2020 for the repainting of the existing buildings to match the newer District buildings.

## Request

The current request is to amend the elevations in order to add painted graphics on the eastern and western elevations of the building known as The Factory. ARB recommended approval by a vote of 4-0.

The request includes seven proposed graphics (*three on the east elevation, and four on the west elevation*) consisting of an application of paint over existing thin brick veneer. The application will be muted & distressed, using colors similar to those used throughout the development. The graphics are approximately 24' in height.

## Discussion

Commissioner Schenberg asked if the images will be changed over time. Ms. Kumerow stated that if the elevations are changed to a different image, a new submittal for review would be required.

Both Chair Hansen and Commissioner Marino expressed their appreciation of the graphics noting that they add interest and character to the structure.

Mr. Ridenhour, Petitioner, stated he was available for questions.

**Commissioner Schenberg made a motion recommending approval of the 8<sup>th</sup> Amended Architectural Elevations, as presented, for Chesterfield Outlets (The District). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wuennenberg.**

Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:

**Aye:** Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Marino, Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Roach, Commissioner Schenberg, Commissioner Staniforth, Commissioner Tilman, Chair Hansen

**Nay:** None

The motion **passed** by a vote of 9 to 0.

## VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. P.Z. 10-2020 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code - Articles 3 and 10):** An ordinance amending Article 3 and Article 10 of the Unified Development Code pertaining to uses and definitions.

Planner Annisa Kumerow stated that at the October 12, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting, the Commission provided direction to Staff regarding the *automobile dealership* use. At the subsequent November 23<sup>rd</sup> Public Hearing, three issues were raised by the Commission:

1. Vehicle Storage: *Separate storage uses desired*
2. Motorcycle Dealership Term: *Replace language referring to "all other vehicles" with "similar vehicles"*
3. Airplanes: *Include use terms for airplane sales, which the UDC currently lacks*



Staff has since drafted language pertaining to Permitted Uses for Sales and Storage:

### Permitted Uses – Sales

- The *Automobile Dealership* use has been split into three distinct use categories:
  - 1) Automobile Dealership
  - 2) Motorcycle, ATV, and Similar Motor Vehicles Dealership; and
  - 3) Recreational Vehicle Dealership
- *Boat (and Marine Supply) Storage, Charter, Repair, Sales* use is now solely a *Boat (and Marine Supply) Dealership* use
- The existing *Trucks, Trailers, Construction Equipment, Agricultural Equipment Sales, Rental, Leasing, Outdoor Storage* use has been modified so that the use now refers to **sales only**.
- *Aircraft Sales and Leasing Facilities and Services* use has been added.

### Permitted Uses – Storage

At the public hearing, concerns were raised regarding several uses, such as the *Boat Storage* use, that allowed for both storage and sales. To address that concern, Staff has drafted corresponding storage uses for:

- Automobile Storage
- Motorcycle, ATV, and Similar Motor Vehicles Storage
- Recreational Vehicle Storage
- Harbor, Marina, and Dock for Waterborne Vehicles (*existing use*)
- Trucks, Trailers, Construction Equipment, and Agricultural Equipment Storage

### Aircraft Sales Use

A new use term has been drafted for *Aircraft Sales and Leasing Facilities and Services*:

A business primarily engaged in the marketing of new or used aircraft. Secondary supporting uses may also exist upon the same site, such as maintenance, repair, and service areas, parts storage areas, and financial service areas.

### Automobile Use

The definition for *Automobile Dealership* has been revised to strictly clarify that the use pertains to the sale of standard passenger vehicles only. (*changes shown in red.*)

A retail business primarily housed in a structure and characterized by a mixture of related uses upon a commercial site; however, the principal use of the site shall be the marketing of **new or used four-wheeled motor vehicles designed for passenger transport, including passenger cars and light-duty trucks (such as pickup trucks, sport utility vehicles, vans, and minivans)**. Secondary supporting uses may also exist upon the same site, such as maintenance, repair and service areas, parts storage areas, and financial service areas.”

A new use for *Automobile Storage* has been added.

A business engaged in the storage of four-wheeled motor vehicles designed for passenger transport, including passenger cars and light-duty trucks (such as pickup trucks, sport utility vehicles, vans, and minivans) that are not sold on the premises.

### **ATV and RV Uses**

Definitions relative to **dealerships** for ATV and RV uses have been modified; and two new uses pertaining to **storage** of ATVs and RVs are proposed. (*changes shown in red.*)

#### Motorcycle, ATV, and Similar Vehicles Dealership

A retail business primarily engaged in the marketing of new or used motorcycles, motor scooters, motorbikes, mopeds, off-road all-terrain vehicles (ATV), jet skis, and other motor vehicles (except passenger cars, trucks, recreational vehicles, and boats). Secondary supporting uses may also exist upon the same site, such as maintenance, repair, and service areas, parts storage areas, and financial service areas.

#### Motorcycle, ATV, and Similar Vehicles Storage

A business engaged in the storage of motorcycles, motor scooters, motorbikes, mopeds, off-road all-terrain vehicles (ATV), jet skis, and other motor vehicles that are not sold on the premises.

#### Recreational Vehicle Dealership

A retail business primarily housed in a structure and characterized by a mixture of related uses upon a commercial site; however, the principal use of the site shall be the marketing of new or used recreational vehicles, commonly referred to as RVs. Secondary supporting uses may also exist upon the same site, such as maintenance, repair, and service areas, parts storage areas, and financial service areas.

#### Recreational Vehicle Storage

A business engaged in the storage of recreational vehicles, commonly referred to as RVs, that are not sold on the premises.

### **Trucks, Trailers, Construction Equipment, Agricultural Equipment Uses**

The definition has been revised to strictly clarify that the sales use pertains to medium and heavy duty trucks only. In addition, storage of such equipment has been separated from the sales use. (*changes shown in red.*)

#### Trucks, Trailers, Construction Equipment, Agricultural Equipment Sales, Rental, and Leasing:

The use of any building, land area, or other premises or portion thereof used for the sale, rental, leasing, or outdoor storage of medium and heavy duty trucks, trailers, construction equipment, or agricultural equipment.”

Trucks, Trailers, Construction Equipment, and Agricultural Equipment Outdoor Storage

The use of any building, land area, or other premises or portion thereof used for the storage of medium and heavy duty trucks, trailers, construction equipment, or agricultural equipment.

**Non-Residential Use Table**

The *Non-Residential Use Table* has been updated, as show in red.

USE GROUP	ZONING DISTRICTS						
	PS	AG	PC	NB	PI	LI	MU
<b>COMMERCIAL/SALES</b>							
Aircraft sales and leasing facilities and services					P		
Automobile dealership			P		P		
Automobile storage					P		
Boat (and marine supply) dealership					P		
Harbor, marina, and dock for waterborne vehicles					P		
Motorcycle, ATV, and similar motor vehicles dealership			P		P		
Motorcycle, ATV, and similar motor vehicles storage					P		
Recreational vehicle dealership			P		P		
Recreational vehicle storage					P		
Trucks, trailers, construction equipment, agricultural equipment sales, rental, and leasing					P		
Trucks, trailers, construction equipment, and agricultural equipment outdoor storage					P		

Chair Hansen noted the complexity of this project, and she, along with Commissioner Wuennenberg, complimented Ms. Kumerow on her work.

**Commissioner Schenberg made a motion to approve P.Z. 10-2020 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code - Articles 3 and 10). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Midgley.**

**Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:**

**Aye: Commissioner Marino, Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Roach, Commissioner Schenberg, Commissioner Staniforth, Commissioner Tilman, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Harris, Chair Hansen**

**Nay: None**

**The motion passed by a vote of 9 to 0.**

- B. P.Z. 13-2020 City of Chesterfield (Unified Development Code - Article 4): An ordinance amending Article 4 of the Unified Development Code to revise language pertaining to architectural review design standards.**

Planner Chris Dietz summarized the material presented at the earlier Public Hearing noting that there are three proposed amendments pertaining to:

1. Modification to Existing Buildings;
2. Screening of Rooftop Mechanical Equipment in portions of City Center; and
3. Supplemental updates to provide consistency in this section of Code

**Commissioner Schenberg made a motion to:**

- **Approve the proposed amendment regarding modifications to existing structures;**
- **Approve the proposed amendments regarding supplemental updates to address minor inconsistencies within Article 4 of the Unified Development Code; and**
- **Reject the proposed amendment regarding screening of rooftop mechanical equipment and to keep in place the current language.**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wuennenberg.

**Upon roll call, the vote was as follows:**

**Aye: Commissioner Midgley, Commissioner Roach, Commissioner Schenberg, Commissioner Staniforth, Commissioner Tilman, Commissioner Wuennenberg, Commissioner Harris, Commissioner Marino, Chair Hansen**

**Nay: None**

**The motion passed by a vote of 9 to 0.**

#### **Discussion**

Discussion continued on the proposed language regarding penthouse enclosures.

#### **Proposed Language**

Rooftop equipment in the geographic areas of the City Center (Downtown) and City Center (Urban Transition) land use designations within the City of Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan shall be permitted on roofs of new buildings within architecturally designed, fully enclosed penthouses that complement the building design.

#### **Current Language**

Screen rooftop equipment on all visible sides with materials that are an integral part of the architecture. Parapet walls or screen walls shall be treated as an integral part of the architecture and shall not visually weaken the design of the structure.

Commissioner Tilman noted his objection to requiring rooftop equipment to be fully enclosed within a penthouse. He feels that the current language requiring adequate screening around rooftop units is sufficient. He also believes that ARB has done a good job in managing this by reviewing the height, materials, and color of proposed screens.

Chair Hansen felt that more clarity is needed about a design standard.

Councilmember Hurt stated that ARB has wrestled with this issue with respect to the design standards, and suggested that ARB be asked for their input on the matter.

Mr. Wyse pointed out that the Code currently cites: *screen walls shall be treated as an integral part of the architecture*. He noted that *integral* is defined as: *necessary to make a whole complete; essential or fundamental*. He feels that the existing language in Code is strong enough, but agrees that additional thought needs to be given on how to implement this moving forward.

It was the consensus of the Commission to get ARB's input on the issue before making a final determination on whether the language in Code needs to be updated.

**IX. NEW BUSINESS - None**

**X. COMMITTEE REPORTS - None**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

---

Gene Schenberg, Secretary